

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of October 14, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

### **Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1, and 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Landon, *et al.*, "Deploying Lotus Sametime on the eServer iSeries Server," Redbooks, June 2002 (hereinafter Landon) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0064693 to Pabla, *et al.* (hereinafter Pabla). Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landon in view of Pabla, and in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0267887 to Berger, *et al.* (hereinafter Berger).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have slightly modified the language of Claims 1 and 12 to even more clearly define the present invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification (see, e.g., paragraphs [0008] and [0031]). No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

### **Aspects of Applicants' Invention**

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a collaborative computing method.

The method can include providing a collaborative computing system comprising at least one instant messaging client, the collaborative computing system including presence awareness features that automatically detect online entities that are logged into the

collaborative computing system; and initializing the instant message client within a graphical user interface of the collaborative computing system.

The method also can include establishing at least one customizable search limitation for a search engine, the search limitation preventing users other than users belonging to a predetermined class of users from accessing data records pertaining to one or more predetermined online entities and preventing selected users from receiving data indicating an online presence of one or more predetermined online entities; receiving a search initializing action from the graphical user interface; responsive to the receiving step, presenting search input fields within the graphical user interface; receiving input via the input fields that specifies a search pattern; subject to the at least one search limitation, searching by the search engine at least one record source for online entities that satisfy the search pattern using the presence awareness features; and displaying a search result from the searching step within the graphical user interface.

The method further can include selecting at least one of the online entities displayed in the search result; and establishing a software-enhanced communication including at least one communication other than instant messaging type communications between a user of the instant messaging client and the selected online entity.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0008], [0031] and [0043] to [0044]; see also Fig. 5.

### **The Claims Define Over The Prior Art**

It was asserted on page 9 of the Office Action that Landon discloses software-enhanced communication not limited to instant messaging [Landon, at least, page 9, 1.3.3, instant meeting, page ix, Preface, 1st paragraph, Sametime offers instant messaging, application sharing, and virtual meetings all in one simple tool, page 2, section 1.1 "What is Sametime"].

It is noted that instant meeting is considered an instant messaging type or related communication. Although page ix, Preface, 1st paragraph, of Landon discloses that Sametime offers instant messaging, application sharing, and virtual meetings all in one simple tool, Landon does not disclose that all these communications are initiated from the instant messaging GUI.

It was asserted on page 10 of the Office Action that Landon discloses specifying a search limitation [Landon, page 201, a search limitation can be a name]. Additionally, preventing a user from accessing a specific class is set up in an Access Control List (ACL), so only certain users can look up a specific class of users [Landon, page 6, 1.2.9]. Presence information during the search is found in Pabla who disclose search or query the instant messaging distributed index of presence information to discover the presence of other participating peers [Pabla, paragraphs 114 and 139].

As indicated in paragraph [0008] of the Specification of the instant application, conventional Lotus Sametime (TM) type applications lack the online entity search capability of the present invention, especially the ability to establish customizable search limitations for the search engine. It is noted that a name is not a search limitation, but rather a search criterion or search input. The ACL of databases on the Sametime server can be used to provide users with anonymous access or basic password authentication to individual databases on the server, but does not establish search limitations for a search engine to prevent the search engine from accessing data records pertaining to certain predetermined online entities. Pabla discloses that joining peers may search or query the instant messaging distributed index of presence information to discover the presence of other participating peers. This has nothing to do with establishing search limitations, especially search limitations preventing selected users from receiving data indicating an online presence of certain predetermined online entities

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1 and 12, as amended. Applicants therefore

respectfully submit that amended Claims 1 and 12 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claims 1 or 12 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: November 24, 2008

/Gregory A. Nelson/  
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577  
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150  
Customer No. 40987  
Post Office Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000